

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

BRONSON SHELLEY,)	Civil Action No. 4:18-cv-2259-JFA-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
-vs-)	
)	
)	ORDER
)	
BRYAN P. STIRLING, MICHAEL)	
McCALL, WARDEN MR. RILEY,)	
ASSOC. WARDEN MS. THOMPSON,)	
MAJOR MR. JACKSON, CAPTAIN)	
MS. HOLSINGER, LT. MR. BELL, LT.)	
TRAVIS REESE, LT. MS. HOUSTEN,)	
LT. MR. MARONE, LT. MS. FLEMMING,)	
SGT. SHELBA RIGHT, SGT. MS.)	
TRIBBLE, MR. GOODSON, MS. GIBSON,)	
SMU OFFICER BOUYAN, individually)	
and in their official capacities,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that Defendants violated his constitutional rights by being deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs. Presently before the court is Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (ECF No. 64). All pretrial All pretrial proceedings in this case were referred to the undersigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and (B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), DSC.

Plaintiff served interrogatories and requests for production on Defendants on November 28, 2018, and Defendants¹ served their responses on February 8, 2019. In his present motion to compel, Plaintiff argues that Defendants "refused to answer each question correctly and submitted the same

¹Except for Sgt. Ms. Tribble or Lt. Mr. Marone. The undersigned has recommended that these Defendants be summarily dismissed from this action. See Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 45).

repetitive answer for each question.” Pl. Mot. to Compel p. 1. Plaintiff also argues that he has not fully received the documents he requested. Plaintiff does not, however, point to the specific discovery responses with which he takes issue. With respect to Plaintiff’s request for documents, Defendants included a list of documents they were producing and referred back to that list for each of Plaintiff’s requests. Plaintiff has not specified how these responses are insufficient. Absent further argument from Plaintiff as to why Defendants’ discovery responses fail to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court cannot determine whether their responses are appropriate. Thus, Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (ECF No. 64) is **DENIED** as filed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

April 11, 2019
Florence, South Carolina